UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/557,820	11/23/2005	Kwan Young Han	P2614US00	2544
	7590 01/22/201 ASSOCIATES , PLC	EXAMINER		
8500 LEESBUI SUITE 7500		TRAN, TONY		
VIENNA, VA	22182	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2894	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/22/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT@PARK-LAW.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/557,820	HAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
TONY TRAN	2894	

	TONY TRAN	2894	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	Carrage 10h 07 OFD 44 07 mg at ha 6	The state of the state of the	6 (l l - t 6
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	offesponding number of finally reje	cied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after en	try is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Kimberly D Nguyen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2894			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to Claims 1 and 16, Applicant argues that "A "heat sink" does not include any element that conducts heat, as the Office Action appears to suggest. And a person of ordinary skill in this art would not interpret the term "heat sink" to encompass a cathode of Roberts's dies 1910 and 1911. Equating cathodes of dies with heat sinks merely because the cathodes conduct heat goes far beyond any reasonable meaning of "heat sink." This arbitrary analysis can not possibly support a prima facie case of obviousness. Further, these claim rejections can not withstand appeal for this reason alone." Examiner respectfully disagrees because THE WHOLE 501-505, [FIG. 5] ARE CONSIDERED AS A HEAT SINK BECAUSE THEY ARE "SINKING THE HEAT" AS A DEFINITION OF HEAT SINK, SINCE THEY ARE ELECTRICAL AND THERMALLY CONNECT TO 201 AS SHOWN IN FIGS. 5, 13 AND 16a,19a. Furthermore, Applicant further states that "Thus, it is clear that the heat extraction member 204 in Roberts's Fig. 19A CAN NOT POSSIBLY BE MADE OF CERAMIC. If it were made of ceramic, then the dies 1910 and 1911 could not be electrically bonded to it (see Roberts, col. 29, lines 18-21 & col. 29, line 67 - col. 30, line 4). Hence, the Office Action inappropriately relies on the heat extraction member 204 of Fig. 19A to teach the insulation main body of claims 1 and 16." Examiner respectfully submits that it is CLEARLY SAID IN COL. 9, LINES 61-65 & COL. 10, LINES 1-10 WHERE IN 204 COULD MADE BY CERAMIC. Finally, Claims 2-15 and 17-18 depends on claims and 16. Since the rejections of claims 1 and 16 are valid and stand. Thus, the rejections of claims 2-15 and 17-18 are valid a stand as well.